

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/792,270	03/04/2004	Frank Oldorff	03100142US	4233
	7590 06/05/2007 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.	EXAMINER		
1950 ROLANE	O CLARKE PLACE	KILIMAN, LESZEK B		
RESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1773	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/05/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summers		10/792,270	OLDORFF, FRANK	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	The MAILING DATE of this communication	leszek b. kiliman	1773	
Period fo		appears on the cover sheet w	iun une correspondence addres	55
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pure te to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by s reply received by the Office later than three months after the r ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n rinod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tatute, cause the application to become Al	CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this commu BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on ()1 March 2007.		
•	· · ·	This action is non-final.		
	Since this application is in condition for allo closed in accordance with the practice und	owance except for formal mat	· · ·	erits is
Disnosit	ion of Claims	,,		
	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are pending in the applica	tion		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-14</u> is/are rejected.			
· · _	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	nd/or election requirement.		
-				
	ion Papers			
	The specification is objected to by the Exar		to the Execution	
10)	••••	accepted or b) objected to	•	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co The oath or declaration is objected to by the			• •
	Inder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
-	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	aign priority under 25 U.S.C.	(d) or (f)	
	\square All b) \square Some * c) \square None of:		<u>α) - (u) ΟΙ (I).</u>	
a)	1. Certified copies of the priority docun	ants have been received		
			Indication No.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum			~~
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the	· · ·	received in this National Sta	ye
* (application from the International Bu		received	
- 2	See the attached detailed Office action for a	nist of the certified copies not		
Attachmen	t(s)			
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
3) 🔲 Infor	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE r No(s)/Mail Date	3/08) 5) 🛄 Notice of I	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		-;

.

P

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-14are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type

double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of copending Application No.

10/932337. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct

from each other because it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to

rearrange parts of the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/792,270 Art Unit: 1773

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by EP'953.

See page 2, lines 20-58, page 6, lines 1-35, page 7, lines 20-58, page 8, lines 29-48,

example.

•

The remarks filed by Applicants have been considered the claims however remain unpatentable in view of the above rejections.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to leszek b. kiliman whose telephone number is 571-272-1509. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T, 6.30-5.00.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

lk

5.5

LESZEK KILIMAN, PhD PRIMARY EXAMINER